



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,148	01/23/2001	Chien-Sheng Chou	XER 2 0395 D/A0772	3609
7590	06/17/2004			EXAMINER
Albert P. Sharpe, III, Esq. Fay, Sharpe, Fagan, Minnich & McKee, LLP 7th Floor 1100 Superior Avenue Cleveland, OH 44114-2518			PESIN, BORIS M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
			DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<i>[Signature]</i>
	09/768,148	CHOU, CHIEN-SHENG	
	Examiner Boris Pesin	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Claim 14 is missing. Therefore claims 15-29 have been renumbered as 14-28.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al (US 6412008).

In regards to claim 1, Helland teaches a system for generating a requisition for selectable items comprising: a client computer system connected to a network (Figure 3); a server computer system connected to the network, the network interconnecting the client computer system and the server computer system, the client computer configured to allow a plurality of users to access the server computer system (Figure 3); and a server application comprising a user interface running on the server computer system, the server application having a multi-tier architecture comprising a first tier of client application code for initiating processing by the server application in response to input by a user of the client computer system (i.e. *"The multi-tier architecture comprises a client tier for client application code that initiates processing by the server application in response to user input"* Abstract Line 3), a middle tier of object-oriented server application code (i.e. *"a middle tier of object-oriented server application Code"* Abstract, Line 6), and a third tier of shared access and data code (i.e. *"and a database tier of shared access data and management code"* Abstract, Line 7). Helland does not teach an application programming interface configured to allow customization of the user interface. Fields teaches, *"The request may include information regarding the client machine type, browser, and customization options (i.e. preferences). Customization options may include personal (i.e. user) options and group (i.e. department, corporate, etc.) options. These options, along with the client machine type and browser, are used by the server to determine how to customize the requested network file. The server obtains the requested network file, and a server-side customization program customizes the file."* Abstract, Line 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to modify Helland with the teachings of Fields and include a method of customizing the user interface with the motivation to provide for an easy way to create a customized user interface.

In regards to claim 2, Helland and Fields teach all the limitations of claim 1. Helland does not teach a system wherein the user interface comprises one or more interface elements defined using HTML, the interface elements selected from one or more of input elements, form elements, and text elements. Fields teaches, "*A client sends a request for a network file, such as a Web page, to a server. The request may include information regarding the client machine type, browser, and customization options (i.e. preferences). Customization options may include personal (i.e. user) options and group (i.e. department, corporate, etc.) options. These options, along with the client machine type and browser, are used by the server to determine how to customize the requested network file.*" Column 2, Line 40).

In regards to claim 4, Helland and Fields teach all the limitations of claim 1. Helland does not teach a system wherein the client computer system comprises a web browser for accessing the network and communicating with the server over the network. Fields teaches a system wherein the client computer system comprises a web browser for accessing the network and communicating with the server over the network (Figure 1).

Claim 15 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

3. Claims 3, 5-12, and 17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6571245).

In regards to claim 3, Helland and Fields teach all the limitations of claim 1. They do not teach a system wherein the server application comprises server logic configured to: associate one of a plurality of work sites with each of said users; identify items which may be requisitioned by a user associated with the associated work site, and items which may not be requisitioned by a user associated with the associated work site; receive and process a request for one or more selected items; verify that each requested item is an item that may be requisitioned by a user associated with the associated work site; and generate a requisition for the verified items. Huang teaches a system to associate one of a plurality of work sites with each of said users (i.e. "*After a successful login, a personal web page of the user is retrieved from a file server and returned to the local system.*" Abstract, Line 6). Huang further teaches a system to identify items which may be requisitioned by a user associated with the associated work site, and items which may not be requisitioned by a user associated with the associated work site (i.e. "*In an embodiment, for each user, the network maintain three separate folders labeled as secure (or "private"), open (or "publish"), and limited access (or*

"friends")" Column 9, Line 34). Huang further teaches a system to receive and process a request for one or more selected items; verify that each requested item is an item that may be requisitioned by a user associated with the associated work site; and generate a requisition for the verified items (i.e. *"The limited access folder is accessed by clicking on friends folder icon 626 to open a friends folder window 650. The limited access folder contains protected files that are accessible only by those specifically authorized by the user. The extent of the access is also limited to the rights granted by the user, which may include read only, read and write, and others. Each limited access file can be individually tailored with different rights granted to different "friends." For example, friend A may be granted read only access to file X, friend B may be granted full access to the same file, and so on."* Column 10, Line 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Helland and Fields with the teachings of Huang and include a customizable environment with different permissions for different items with the motivation to provide a secure working environment.

In regards to claim 5, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 3. Helland and Fields do not teach a system wherein the server computer system comprises a requester database containing one or more of an user identifier, a password, and personal information for the plurality of users. Huang teaches, *"Login window 1210 includes fields for the user identification and the user password. The login information is entered by the user and transmitted to the site server where it is compared with the information in a login database."* Column 15, Line 1).

In regards to claim 6, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 5. Helland and Fields do not teach a system wherein the requester database contains at least one shared user entry, the shared user entry associated with a single work site. Huang teaches, *"The limited access folder is accessed by clicking on friends folder icon 626 to open a friends folder window 650. The limited access folder contains protected files that are accessible only by those specifically authorized by the user."* Column 10, Line 4).

In regards to claim 7, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 5. Helland and Fields do not teach a system wherein the server computer system further comprises a work site database associating at least one of a plurality of work sites with each of the plurality of users. Huang teaches, *"After a successful login, a personal web page of the user is retrieved from a file server and returned to the local system. Through the personal web page, the user is able to send commands that are received and processed by one or more backend servers. The web page represents the virtual desktop of the user and includes links for applications available to the user, files and folders accessible by the user, and other personal information of the user."* Abstract, Line 6).

In regards to claim 8, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 7. Helland and Fields do not teach a system wherein the server computer system further comprises an inventory database containing information about the selectable items. Huang teaches, *"the desktop layout information, the list of authorized applications, and the personal information for all users may be stored in user*

*information database 278, and the files and folders may be stored in user file database 282. Alternatively, the entire record may be stored on one database at a central server.” Column 8, Line 57).*

In regards to claim 9, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 8. Helland and Fields do not teach a system wherein said information comprises one or more of a item identifying indicia, an item description, and an image representation of each item. Huang teaches, “*the desktop layout information, the list of authorized applications, and the personal information for all users may be stored in user information database 278, and the files and folders may be stored in user file database 282. Alternatively, the entire record may be stored on one database at a central server.” Column 8, Line 57).*

In regards to claim 10, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 8. Helland and Fields do not teach a system further comprising a validation rules datastore associating each of said selectable items with one or more of a plurality of work sites with which a user must be associated to verify the item for a requisition. Huang teaches, “*The user can manage files and folders through a file management system provided by the virtual computing environment. Because of the extensive interconnectivity associated with the Internet, the file management system provides additional advantages and features not normally associated with a stand-alone computer or a local area network. For example, separate folders can be provided for the user's private files, public files, and limited access files. These file types have different attributes.” Column 7, Line 57).*

In regards to claim 11, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 8. Helland and Fields do not teach a system wherein the validation rules are customizable via said application programming interface. Huang teaches, "*The limited access folder contains protected files that are accessible only by those specifically authorized by the user. The extent of the access is also limited to the rights granted by the user, which may include read only, read and write, and others. Each limited access file can be individually tailored with different rights granted to different "friends." For example, friend A may be granted read only access to file X, friend B may be granted full access to the same file, and so on.*" Column 10, Line 6).

In regards to claim 12, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 10. They do not specifically teach a system wherein the validation rules datastore is further configured to associate two or more of said selectable items with a single item identifier. However, official notice is given that it is well known in the art to associate two or more selectable items with a single item identifier (i.e. shortcuts). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Helland, Fields and Huang and include a system to associate two or more selectable items with a single item identifier with the motivation to provide an easy way of accessing the identifier.

Claim 17 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 18, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 17. Fields further teaches a system wherein the client computer system

comprises a web browser for accessing the network and communicating with the server over the network (Figure 1).

In regards to claim 19, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 17. Fields further teaches wherein the client computer system and the server system communicate via the Internet (i.e. *"The system depicted in FIG. 12 may be linked to both local area networks (sometimes referred to as intranets) and wide area networks, such as the Internet."* Column 9, Line 53).

Claim 20 is in the same context as claim 5; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is in the same context as claim 6; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 22, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 17. Fields further teaches a system further comprising providing at least one managerial account associated with a single work site and allowing a user to generate a requisition for any other user associated with said single work site (i.e. *"For example, corporate options may be set by a system administrator, or included in the browser as it is distributed to various clients. Typically, individual users are not able to change corporate options. Corporate options may have to do with security, system performance, screening, etc."* Column 5, Line 45).

In regards to claim 23, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 20. Helland and Fields do not teach a method wherein the step of assigning a work site to a user is performed by retrieving previously stored information associating

each user with at least one of a plurality of work sites. Huang teaches, “*After a successful login, a personal web page of the user is retrieved from a file server and returned to the local system. Through the personal web page, the user is able to send commands that are received and processed by one or more backend servers. The web page represents the virtual desktop of the user and includes links for applications available to the user, files and folders accessible by the user, and other personal information of the user.*” Abstract, Line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Helland and Fields with the teachings of Huang and include a method to retrieve previously stored information and associate it with a work site with the motivation to make the display customized and hence more user friendly.

Claim 24 is in the same context as claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is in the same context as claim 9; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is in the same context as claim 10; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

4. Claims 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6571245) in further view of Lee et al. (US 6611814).

In regards to claim 13, Helland, Fields and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 5. They do not teach a system further comprising a database storing a list of items preselected by the user to be used at a later time to create a requisition. Lee teaches, *"A shopper can create a wish list in an online store and record information on products he or she wants to buy from the store in the list."* Column 1, Line 53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Helland, Fields, and Huang with the teachings of Lee and include a list of items desired with the motivation to provide the user with an easy method of purchasing products at a later time and not having to remember what was desired for purchase.

Claim 27 is in the same context as claim 13; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 14 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6571245) in further view of Walker et al. (US 6466919).

In regards to claim 14, Helland, Fields and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 5. They do not teach a system further comprising a requisition database containing information about previously generated requisitions. Walker teaches, *"The buyer identifier stored in field 565 may be utilized, for example, to index a historical database (not shown) of previous purchases and CPOs associated with the buyer."* Column 11, Line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Helland, Fields and Huang with teachings of Walker and

include a system of tracking previously generated orders with the motivation to without difficulty determine shopping habits of users.

Claim 28 is in the same context as claim 9; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

***Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (703) 305-8774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100